

White ✓

NBC MEET THE PRESS

9 December 1984

EXCERPTED * * * * *

MUDD: Welcome to Meet the Press, Sen. Moynihan, Sen. Lugar. SEN. RICHARD LUGAR (R-Ind.): Thank you.

MUDD: The other day when President Reagan spoke about the story we just watched, he left hanging whether the Iranian government was, in fact, in collaboration with the Shiite terrorists. Do you think the Iranian government is in collaboration with the terrorists? LUGAR: I think it's advisable not to make a comment on that at this moment. It seems to me the president's statement was a good one and ought to stand, really, until this situation is cleared up.

MUDD: Does that mean you don't know whether there's collaboration or not? LUGAR: I think we have, at least, some indications from our own intelligence sources, but I, I, I'll just repeat I think it's inadvisable to discuss that at this particular moment.

MUDD: How 'bout you, Sen. Moynihan? SEN. PATRICK MOYNIHAN (D-N.Y.): Well, Roger, there is one authority in Tehran that could do anything to save the lives of the remaining passengers on board, including our two Americans, that is the government of Iran. This is no time to be critical of them, a time to hope they will understand their international responsibility and of their national interests.

MUDD: What can we do about it, Senator? MOYNIHAN: What can you do? I'm just going off, as you said, my eight years on the Intelligence Committee, and we need to put a lot more resources into the question of terrorism. We have, we're such an old country, we only think of relations between states, between governments, and we have to learn this new element of international force and power, which has nothing to do with governments and states. Long ago, we made a decision with the Soviets, and, and, and Dick, Mr. Chairman, is on the committee too and is going off. We decided that human intelligence wouldn't work. You couldn't send people into the Soviet Union, have them take photographs and get out. So we went to the U-2s, then the satellites, technical means. Human intelligence faded away. Don't you think that in this regard? (to Lugar) We gotta get back into it. We have to know who are those people in Kuwait in jail. We don't know. We have a little bit. Some are Iraqi Shiites, some are no nam, no nationality. We have not found out. We should have, what were our people doing on a Kuwaiti airliner? What were they doing landing in Dubai in security situations which obviously allowed these people to get on board? It's gonna take a lot of people. We probably won't have a great many results, but when you see those photographs, would we dare not try?

Continued

2.

MUDD: Sen. Lugar, what side do you come down on, on the, on the Shultz doctrine that terrorism should be met with acts of, acts of strong retribution? LUGAR: I think the secretary made a very important point. Now, it has not yet been argued through, and it must be, because there are implications through that that probably run counter to our normal thinking, namely, pre-emptive strikes, the ability to go in and disrupt people's lives who may be innocent. The secretary wouldn't want to do that, but that conceivably could be a part of that. On the other hand, he's indicating--and I think this is consistent with Pat Moynihan--we're gonna have to do a great deal more. That means material and people, it means political will. It means an interest in our own people and being much more serious about this. It's not a dilettante game after the fact.

MUDD: We'll continue our questioning on Meet the Press of Sen. Moynihan and Lugar after this message.

KALB: We are back with Sens. Lugar and Moynihan. Sen. Moynihan, do we know who the terrorists are? Don't you have to know that before you can take any action?

MOYNIHAN: Well, exactly, and you had better be putting a great deal more effort than we now make or have made. We have never made this a real part of the agenda of our foreign policy, but, Marvin, what government could know more about a terrorist enterprise than the British government, having dealt with the, the IRA for 70-80 years? And within two, two, two, three months ago, they came within an inch of blowing up the entire British Cabinet. What, the issue is here not so much what you can do to prevent, because frequently you can't. But the one thing you can prevent, the one thing you can deny them is their object, which is to get you to change your society, to cease to be a democratic society, to cease to be an open society. Look what the Italians have had to go through. They've had to see their prime minister murdered, kidnapped, held and murdered, and judges and policeman. They've kept an open society. Their courts are open. Their parliament is open. They have survived, and therefore the Red Brigades lost.

MUDD: Do you, do you agree with that, that you can't change your society to accommodate the existence of terrorists, Senator? LUGAR: You should not change it basically. Obviously, we are doing some things defensively, the battlements around the Capitol, around the *Hart Office Building...

MUDD: That's the, that's the people's government, and to get into that government now, you have to be frisked, don't you really? LUGAR: It is more difficult. Now that is a change in style, in a way. It's not a fundamental change, constitutionally, or in terms of civil rights, in my judgment. And I think we've made some headway against potential terrorism through those means. I would agree with Pat. Defense only works so long. Intelligence is, is

Continued

3

equally important, but I, I think we've been able to hold down to a dull roar the terror activities, at least in this country, during the past year. And that is some gain.

MUDD: But it is, but to see dump trucks filled with sand pulled up in front of the White House... LUGAR: Well, it's unfortunate.

MUDD: ...there's a certain psychological effect on the people. LUGAR: Sure, and, and we would rather that that did not occur, but I would say the, the other

side of the coin is we would rather see that occur than have the White House and

its occupants blown up. MOYNIHAN: Let, let's be clear. There are barriers out

there, but the lights are on in the White House, and the president was just elected, and another one's gonna be elected after him. And we had a bomb go off

in the Senate this year. It, it, it went right through where no one realized were open windows boarded up into the Senate cloakroom. Had the Senate been in session, as we'd expected, well, Dick and I wouldn't have been here. LUGAR: A

lot of people would've been killed, that's for sure. MOYNIHAN: But the Senate would not have been killed. The Senate would've been back in business the next day. That's what we cling to. Our institutions are stronger than these people,

and it's because they can not change our institutions that they act this way.

KALB: Sen. Lugar, do you feel that if we have difficulty, as Sen. Moynihan seemed to be indicating a moment ago, in actually identifying the terrorists, knowing exactly where they are, doesn't that mean that you really can not take preemptive military action as Secretary Shultz indicated we ought to take?

LUGAR: Right, that's the point that needs to be argued through. And clearly, the intelligence preceding those pre-emptive attacks is of the essence if we are

to be true to our own ideals, and I think we want to be. To indiscriminately attack people for the sake of making a point would not be true to those ideals, and simply is not going to wash with the American people.

KALB: Well, so that you really can't effectively have pre-emptive military action? LUGAR: You can do a lot. Now prior to this election...

KALB: Military action? LUGAR: Well, prior to this election, the, the, the problems with that Beirut embassy, the possibility of a third attack engaged everybody's attention, as rightly they should've. One can argue that they should've, the first and the second time too. But the third time, we really were on top of this, backward and forward, and, and I would say it wasn't so much a military attack. Although, there would, I think, have been pre-emptive action in the even that we had isolated persons who were about to perpetrate some new difficulty with that embassy. They, they cease and desist, at least for the time, and, and that was a game. MOYNIHAN: I, I, I...

Continued

4.

KALB: Senator, wasn't there a possibility just before this election in November that we might very well have taken pre-emptive action, that there was a threat, we thought we knew who was going to do it, and we were very close to taking that action? MOYNIHAN: We thought we knew who was going to do it. We didn't know where they were. And that's the common condition. May I say, however, I have been an ambassador and in, in India. Once, as a Christmas party was about to bring the whole of the American community in this one building, the Indian secret police, I mean, the Indian counterintelligence, picked up a plot, spotted the people, told us, let us make the decision about taking the risk, sent us all the troops we could, could use. They surrounded the building, and the wives decided to have the party. But they were onto something. You can learn things. These, there are logistics involved in moving the weaponries around and the plastic and the pliers and all, and you can do a lot more if you were work at it.

KALB: You can do a lot more, but can you actually take preemptive military action? MOYNIHAN: If you have solid information, yes, you can. We, frequently, do you frequently get such information? No, you won't.

* * * * *